

or technical staff, travel, equipment, etc., are essential to achieving project objectives.

(ii) Justify that the total budget, including funds requested from USDA and any matching support provided, will be adequate to carry out the activities of the project. Provide a summary of sources and amounts of all third party matching support.

(iii) Justify the project's cost-effectiveness. Show how the project maximizes the use of limited resources, optimizes educational value for the dollar, achieves economies of scale, or leverages additional funds. For example, discuss how the project has the potential to generate a critical mass of expertise and activity focused on a targeted need area, or to promote coalition building that could lead to future ventures.

(iv) Include the percentage of time key personnel will work on the project, both during the academic year and summer. When salaries of university personnel will be paid by a combination of USDA and institutional funds, the total compensation must not exceed the faculty member's regular annual compensation. In addition, the total commitment of time devoted to the project, when combined with time for teaching and research duties, other sponsored agreements, and other employment obligations to the institution, must not exceed 100 percent of the normal workload for which the employee is compensated, in accordance with established university policies and applicable Federal cost principles.

(v) If the proposal addresses more than one targeted need area (e.g., student experiential learning and instruction delivery systems), estimate the proportion of the funds requested from USDA that will support each respective targeted need area.

(h) *Current and pending support.* Each applicant must complete Form CSREES-663, "Current and Pending Support," identifying any other current public- or private-sponsored projects, in addition to the proposed project, to which key personnel listed in the proposal under consideration have committed portions of their time, whether or not salary support for the person(s) involved is included in the

budgets of the various projects. This information should also be provided for any pending proposals which are currently being considered by, or which will be submitted in the near future to other possible sponsors, including other USDA programs or agencies. Concurrent submission of identical or similar projects to other possible sponsors will not prejudice the review or evaluation of a project under this program.

(i) *Appendix.* Each project narrative is expected to be complete in itself and to meet the 20-page limitation. Inclusion of material in an Appendix should not be used to circumvent the 20-page limitation of the proposal narrative. However, in those instances where inclusion of supplemental information is necessary to guarantee the peer review panel's complete understanding of a proposal or to illustrate the integrity of the design or a main thesis of the proposal, such information may be included in an Appendix. Examples of supplemental material are photographs, journal reprints, brochures and other pertinent materials which are deemed to be illustrative of major points in the narrative but unsuitable for inclusion in the proposal narrative itself. Information on previously submitted proposals may also be presented in the Appendix (refer to §3405.11(d)). When possible, information in the Appendix should be presented in tabular format. A complete set of the Appendix material must be attached to each copy of the grant application submitted. The Appendix must be identified with the title of the project as it appears on Form CSREES-712 of the proposal and the name(s) of the project director(s). The Appendix must be referenced in the proposal narrative.

Subpart D—Submission of a Proposal

§ 3405.12 Intent to submit a proposal.

To assist CSREES in preparing for the review of proposals, institutions planning to submit proposals may be requested to complete Form CSREES-711, "Intent to Submit a Proposal," provided in the application package. CSREES will determine each year if Intent to Submit a Proposal forms will

§ 3405.13

be requested and provide such information in the program announcement. If Intent to Submit a Proposal forms are required, one form should be completed and returned for each proposal an institution anticipates submitting. Submitting this form does not commit an institution to any course of action, nor does failure to send this form prohibit an institution from submitting a proposal.

§ 3405.13 When and where to submit a proposal.

The program announcement will provide the deadline date for submitting a proposal, the number of copies of each proposal that must be submitted, and the address to which proposals must be submitted.

7 CFR Ch. XXXIV (1–1–01 Edition)

Subpart E—Proposal Review and Evaluation

§ 3405.14 Proposal review.

The proposal evaluation process includes both internal staff review and merit evaluation by peer review panels comprised of scientists, educators, business representatives, and Government officials. Peer review panels will be selected and structured to provide optimum expertise and objective judgment in the evaluation of proposals.

§ 3405.15 Evaluation criteria.

The maximum score a proposal can receive is 200 points. Unless otherwise stated in the annual solicitation published in the FEDERAL REGISTER, the peer review panel will consider the following criteria and weights to evaluate proposals submitted:

Evaluation Criterion	Weight
(a) <i>Potential for advancing the quality of education:</i> This criterion is used to assess the likelihood that the project will have a substantial impact upon and advance the quality of food and agricultural sciences higher education by strengthening institutional capacities through promoting education reform to meet clearly delineated needs.	
(1) Impact—Does the project address a targeted need area(s)? Is the problem or opportunity clearly documented? Does the project address a State, regional, national, or international problem or opportunity? Will the benefits to be derived from the project transcend the applicant institution and/or the grant period? Is it probable that other institutions will adapt this project for their own use? Can the project serve as a model for others?	20 points.
(2) Continuation plans—Are there plans for continuation or expansion of the project beyond USDA support? Are there indications of external, non-Federal support? Are there realistic plans for making the project self-supporting?	10 points.
(3) Innovation—Are significant aspects of the project based on an innovative or a non-traditional approach toward solving a higher education problem or strengthening the quality of higher education in the food and agricultural sciences? If successful, is the project likely to lead to education reform?	20 points.
(4) Products and results—Are the expected products and results of the project clearly explained? Do they have the potential to strengthen food and agricultural sciences higher education? Are the products likely to be of high quality? Will the project contribute to a better understanding of or improvement in the quality, distribution, effectiveness, or racial, ethnic, or gender diversity of the Nation's food and agricultural scientific and professional expertise base?	20 points.
(b) <i>Overall approach and cooperative linkages:</i> This criterion relates to the soundness of the proposed approach and the quality of the partnerships likely to evolve as a result of the project.	
(1) Proposed approach—Do the objectives and plan of operation appear to be sound and appropriate relative to the targeted need area(s) and the impact anticipated? Are the procedures managerially, educationally, and/or scientifically sound? Is the overall plan integrated with or does it expand upon other major efforts to improve the quality of food and agricultural sciences higher education? Does the timetable appear to be readily achievable?	20 points.
(2) Evaluation—Are the evaluation plans adequate and reasonable? Do they allow for continuous and/or frequent feedback during the life of the project? Are the individuals involved in project evaluation skilled in evaluation strategies and procedures? Can they provide an objective evaluation? Do evaluation plans facilitate the measurement of project progress and outcomes?	10 points.
(3) Dissemination—Does the proposed project include clearly outlined and realistic mechanisms that will lead to widespread dissemination of project results, including national electronic communication systems, publications, presentations at professional conferences, and/or use by faculty development or research/teaching skills workshops.	10 points.
(4) Partnerships and collaborative efforts—Will the project expand partnership ventures among disciplines at a university, between colleges and universities, or with the private sector? Will the project lead to long-term relationships or cooperative partnerships that are likely to enhance program quality or supplement resources available to food and agricultural sciences higher education?	20 points.
(c) <i>Institutional commitment and resources:</i>	